DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 725 HE 008 787

AUTHOR	Adams, Charles C.
TITLE	Faculty Awards Programs: Campus-Based and Systemwide.
INSTITUTION	California State Univ., Long Beach. Center for Professional Development.
SPONS AGENCY	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	15 Jan 77
NOTE	39p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for Professional Development, The California State University and Colleges, 400 Golden Shore, Long Beach, California 90802
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Awards; *College Faculty; Effective Teaching; *Evaluation Criteria; Fees; Higher Education; *Professional Recognition; Salaries; School Surveys; State Colleges; State Universities; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Motivation; Tuition
IDENTIFIERS	*California State University and Colleges; *Faculty Development

ABSTRACT

In the California State University and College system, numerous campus-based and systemwide efforts have evolved to provide special recognition to faculty members exhibiting high-level teaching ability and demonstrating distinction as teachers. Existing award programs designed to give recognition for outstanding performances in this area are reported. The programs themselves and the criteria employed in them are described. In the course of the survey, questions arose concerning the use of the coursework Fee Waiver Program for faculty. A description of this program is offered along with some ways in which faculty are using the opportunities it provides. The optional Special Salary Ranges program is also discussed. More relevant awards are detailed in these categories: Outstanding Professor Awards, Distinguished Teaching Awards, and Professional Service Awards. (LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136725

FACULTY AWARDS PROGRAM:

CAMPUS-BASED AND SYSTEMWIDE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
The California State University and Colleges
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802

HE 008 782

FACULTY AWARDS PROGRAMS:

CAMPUS-BASED AND SYSTEMWIDE

prepared by

Dr. Charles C. Adams, Director
Faculty Development Programs
California State University, Chico
Chico, California 95929

for the

CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
The California State University and Colleges
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802

January 15, 1977

The preparation of this document was supported, in part, by a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Foreword i

I. Outstanding Professor Awards 1

II. Distinguished Teaching Awards 6

III. Professional Service Awards 10

IV. A Survey of Campus-Based Awards 13
Introduction 13
Bakersfield 13
Chico 14
Dominguez Hills 14
Fresno 15
Fullerton 15
Hayward 16
Humboldt 16
Long Beach 16
Los Angeles 17
Northridge 17
Pomona 18
Sacramento 19
San Bernardino 19
San Diego 19
San Francisco 20
San Jose 21
San Luis Obispo 21
Sonoma 21
Stanislaus 22

V. A Commentary on Criteria 23
General Comment on Categories 23
Teaching 24
Scholarship 25
Promise 25
Other 25
Evidence 26

APPENDIX 28
A. Center for Professional Development List of Policy Board Members 29
B. The Course Work Fee Waiver Program 30
C. Special Salary Ranges: Grant-Related Instructional Faculty 33

FOREWORD

American higher education is undergoing significant changes. Its place in society, its rewards structure, and new forces acting upon its rather traditional structure, all contribute to a changing role. The life of the professional is undergoing a corresponding rapid change. Individuals teaching in colleges and universities first suspected and now certainly know that the "Hall of Ivy" cultural myth, as good and seductive as it is, no longer reflects reality. For example, rewards for scholarly activity as they relate to effective teaching are no longer easily identified. The need to clarify worthwhile criteria and processes involved in the recognition of outstanding performance for teaching has become increasingly apparent.

The California State University and Colleges, both as a system and as individual campuses, have a long-standing dedication to quality instruction and scholarship. Numerous campus-based and systemwide efforts have evolved to provide special recognition to faculty members who exhibit high level teaching ability and have demonstrated distinction as teachers. This report is the result of an attempt to identify existing award programs designed to give recognition for outstanding performances in this area within the CSUC system.

In the summer of 1976, Dr. Charles C. Adams was commissioned to do a survey of all campuses of the CSUC system to ascertain the types of award programs in existence. Dr. Adams was selected as the primary investigator as one who already possessed data on this subject and who, because of his close association with the Statewide Academic Senate, had the appropriate contacts on each campus to facilitate gathering additional information. The data gathered clearly support the notion that the CSUC system is committed to good teaching.

Although this document may be of historical interest, it is hoped that it will have additional value. The descriptions of the programs and the criteria employed may provide the reader additional avenues to explore and ideas to consider.

In the course of the survey, questions arose concerning the use of the coursework Fee Waiver Program for faculty. A description of this program and some ways which faculty are using the opportunities it offers are presented in Appendix B. Similarly, the optional Special Salary Ranges program is discussed in Appendix C. Though neither of these programs is an awards program in the usual sense, it seems appropriate to include relevant descriptive information in this report giving their underlying rationales.

Some award programs may have been overlooked. For that matter, it is not clear what constitutes an award program. Your assistance is solicited in comments on the programs described as well as any additional information concerning awards for effective teaching that are operational in the CSUC system that have been omitted. All such comments should be forwarded to the Center for Professional Development, Chancellor's Office.

David H. Ost, Director
Center for Professional Development

I. OUTSTANDING PROFESSOR AWARDS

In the academic year 1963-64 the Board of Trustees began sponsorship of a program to select faculty members within The California State University and Colleges to achieve recognition in receiving Outstanding Professor Awards. Since the inception of the program, the Board of Directors of The California State University and Colleges Foundation has made a $1,000 honorarium available to each of the two Outstanding Professors selected each year. There is some suggestion in the background of this award that in the first competition the Board was thinking of one award, but two nominees were so indistinguishable, they decided to give two awards. That precedent has been followed since. The funds for the awards are provided by the Joseph M. Schenk Foundation of Los Angeles; they were initially arranged for in 1963 by Trustee Gregston Bautzer. To date twenty-six awards have been granted.

The process for nomination and selection has been pretty much the same since the beginning of the program, though a few minor modifications have been made on occasion.

The individual campus presidents are notified of the annual competition not later than November 15 in a given academic year and are requested to submit nominations and supporting material if the campus wishes to participate. This notification-request is usually forwarded jointly by the Chancellor's Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs and the Academic Senate.

The call normally suggests a nomination from each campus, but provision has been made in some annual notification documents for "one additional candidate, when circumstances warrant."

The deadline for submission of nominations and supporting material by the campus has traditionally been March 15, but the record indicates both earlier and later variations in the deadline, e.g., March 1 and April 1. Not uncommonly, in recent years at least, a few campuses have asked for extensions of time because they have begun late and have experienced some delay in the process. These extensions are ordinarily granted, unless they are not reasonable in light of systemwide review and reporting schedules.

When the Distinguished Teaching Award Program was operating, nominations were usually made from among faculty nominated for the Distinguished Teaching Awards on the campus, but the guidelines in FSA 66-15 (occasionally quoted in calls thereafter) state:

> Each college should determine for itself whether to confine its nomination(s) for this award to those nominated on their campus for the new teaching awards or to broaden the competition, since the criteria for the outstanding professor awards are somewhat broader in concept than the teaching awards.

It is possible that nominations at one time on some campuses were prepared without the participation of a selection committee, but guidelines in recent years have specified that "Selection of a nominee should be made by a college-wide committee of the faculty."

The criteria for selection include: (a) scholarship, publications and creative production; (b) teaching effectiveness; (c) service to college and community; and (d) full vitae including honors, awards and special recognition.

Evidence on these bases in support of a nominee's candidacy is expected to include statements from administrators, colleagues in his/her department, colleagues outside his/her immediate academic unit, students and alumni and off-campus experts in his/her field.

These basic criteria have been expanded and embellished in various annual requests for nominations and the *ad hoc* practices of campus and systemwide selection committees. The systemwide screening Committee chosen by the Academic Senate has from time to time made recommendations for changes in criteria and procedures which have for the most part been incorporated into the "Guidelines" accompanying the call for participation. For example, the 1968 FSA encouraging nominations included modifications recommended by the 1966/67 Academic Senate Committee. That year's guidelines specified that a nominee should have:

> contributed to the stature of the California State Colleges because of the outstanding nature of his contributions to his field in terms of teaching, research, and publication or creative production, which have *earned* him *national or international recognition.* [Emphasis mine, C.C.A.]

Furthermore, the guidelines suggested that "A candidate should have made a significant part of his contribution *while a member of a California State College faculty.* [Emphasis mine, C.C.A.] The call in 1973 added the advice that candidates "should be individuals who have strong credentials in *two or more of the areas"* specified in the criteria.

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR THE TRUSTEES' OUTSTANDING PROFESSOR AWARD*

Preamble

The Trustees' Outstanding Professor Award is given to honor a distinguished scholar who has contributed to the stature of the California State Colleges because of the outstanding nature of his contribution to his field in terms of teaching, research, and publication or creative production, which have earned him national or international recognition. It should be noted that this award is distinct from a teaching award and is much broader in scope.

Procedure

1. Selection of a nominee should be made by a college-wide committee of the faculty.

2. Evidence in support of a nominee's candidacy should include statements from (1) administrators, (2) colleagues in his department, (3) colleagues outside of his division or school, (4) students and alumnae, and (5) off-campus experts in his field.

3. A candidate should have made a significant part of his contribution while a member of a California State College faculty.

4. A college should submit at least seven (7) copies of all evidence in support of a nominee's candidacy, which evidence should include (a) scholarship, publications and creative production; (b) teaching effectiveness; (c) service to college and community; and (d) full vitae including honors, awards, and special recognition.

5. The deadline for notification of individual campuses for the submission of names of nominees should be not later than November 15. The deadline for submission of material in support of a nominee's candidacy by individual campuses should be not later than March 15. The *ad hoc* Committee to Select the Trustees' Outstanding Professors should begin to confer no later than April 1 and the Chancellor should be notified of the Committee's recommendation no later than May 1.

---

*These guidelines are not intended to be exhaustive.

The 1975/76 systemwide committee gave special attention to the *sustained* quality of performance as opposed to the cases of professors who have made reputations on a single, possibly anomalous contribution. It also made an attempt to distinguish among publications to give more weight to contributions accepted by a somewhat rigorous selection process, as in refereed journals, than to those in which publication is easy and more or less automatic. The committee also regarded reports of student evaluation, a species of evidence with respect to teaching effectiveness which has become available as the result of more recent personnel practices, but did not exist in earlier years of the competition. It also paid particular attention to evidence of the extended performance of graduate students who began graduate work under the supervision of the candidate.

In general, the modifications appear to have been designed to give definition to the term *outstanding*, to distinguish the selection process from that of normal campus RTP and the now-defunct distinguished teaching awards, and to incorporate a broader and up-to-date evidenciary base for the selections.

The campus is asked to submit at least seven copies of the nomination brochure, including all evidence in support of the nominee's candidacy. Submission is made to the Chairman of the Systemwide Academic Senate.

The selection of the two nominees to be recommended to the CSUC Foundation Board of Directors is made by an *ad hoc* committee of the Academic Senate appointed annually by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. This committee consists of five members, selected with a view to achieving a variety of campuses and academic disciplines which its members represent. Some attention has been given to continuity from the preceding year's committee in at least two of the newly appointed members. Until two years ago, the members were chosen from among faculty not on the Academic Senate. This arrangement created a special financial burden for the Academic Senate in underwriting the travel and per diem of members for special meetings of at least three total days duration. Recently the members have been selected from Senate membership, with consideration still being given to distribution of members among campuses and disciplines and to continuity. Thus, the committee can meet in conjunction with Senate meetings with no additional cost for travel and only a bit more for per diem. The total cost to the Senate, at one time in the neighborhood of $1,000 annually, has been cut to barely a quarter of that sum.

The *ad hoc* committee selects its own chairman, who, with the support of the Academic Senate staff, receives and distributes to committee members the materials submitted by the campuses.

The committee usually meets two or three times – in January, March, and May. It discusses criteria and procedures and the nominations themselves. In May the selections are made and the recommendations are forwarded to the Board of Directors by the Chairman of the Academic Senate through the Chancellor. In the early years of the award the Chancellor and the Foundation Board of Directors appear to have been somewhat more involved in the selection process than they now are. The Board has in recent years accepted the recommendations of the Academic Senate Committee on pretty much a *pro forma* basis.

In 1975-76, for the first time, the announcement of the recipients was made by the Chancellor to the Board of Trustees and the public at the May meeting of the Board instead of at the July meeting, which had traditionally been the occasion of the announcement. The change was made, upon the recommendation of the Academic Senate, with the hope that the earlier disclosure would allow some recognition of the recipients during commencement at their respective campuses. Given the early dates of commencements on some campuses and the lateness in May of the Board meeting, the intended objective of this change may not always be achieved.

For several years there was also a certain tentativeness about the process until the Schenk Foundation made its annual commitment of funds to the program, which could come as late as the deadline for submission of campus materials. The Academic Senate in 1973-74 made the decision to begin the process with the understanding that the Outstanding Professors would be selected and appropriately honored even if, perchance, the honoraria were not forthcoming from the Schenk Foundation. The selectees would be announced to the Board, and invited personally to the Board meeting. Additionally, the Academic Senate would recognize the selectees at its September meeting. The Outstanding Professors are introduced to the Senate, given appropriate commemorative plaques, and hosted by the Executive Committee for lunch or dinner. Recipients have thus far responded warmly to this recognition by the representative body of their "peers" throughout the system.

Participation by individual campuses has not been complete or consistent through the thirteen years of the program. On an average, twelve to fourteen of the now nineteen campuses have participated annually. Occasionally a campus simply does not "get its act together" in order to respond to the request in a timely manner. Newly established campuses have naturally deferred participation for a time after their beginning. A few campus faculty representative bodies formally refuse each year to participate when informed by the president of the call for nominations. They do this on the basis of principle. Some of the reasons given are concern for fairness, potential politicization of process, alleged inadequacy of only one nominee per campus and two awards systemwide to be just, etc. One of those regularly non-participating campuses appears to be taking steps to rescind the previously established prohibition.

To date nine campuses have nominated eventual selectees at least once. One campus has had six recipients, another five, another four, another three; three campuses have had two each and two have had one each.

OUTSTANDING PROFESSOR AWARD RECIPIENTS
1963-1976

Year	Recipients
1963-64	Dr. Solomon Diamond, Professor of Psychology, California State College, Los Angeles Dr. Richard Madden, Professor of Education, Sonoma State College
1964-65	Dr. Lloyd Ingles, Professor of Zoology, Fresno State College Dr. Miles D. McCarthy, Professor of Biology California State College, Fullerton
1965-66	Dr. Abraham P. Nasatir, Professor of History, San Diego State College Mr. Hudson Roysher, Professor of Art, California State College, Los Angeles
1966-67	Dr. Charles Burdick, Professor of History, San Jose State College Dr. Lewis Yablonsky, Professor of Sociology, San Fernando Valley State College

Year	Recipients
1967-68	Dr. John Gimbel, Professor of History, Humboldt State College Dr. David Ward-Steinman, Professor of Music, San Diego State College
1968-69	Dr. Vern L. Bullough, Professor of History, San Fernando Valley State College Dr. Arne N. Wick, Professor of Chemistry, San Diego State College
1969-70	Dr. Joseph Casanova, Jr., Professor of Chemistry, California State College, Los Angeles Dr. Peter Koestenbaum, Professor of Philosophy, San Jose State College
1970-71	Dr. Gilbert Geis, Professor of Sociology, California State College, Los Angeles Dr. Aurelio De La Vega, Professor of Music, San Fernando Valley State College
1971-72	Dr. Philip Levine, Professor of English, California State University, Fresno Dr. Richard H. Lawson, Professor of German California State University, San Diego
1972-73	Dr. Coox, Professor of History, California State University, San Diego Dr. Kauffman, Professor of Chemistry, California State University, Fresno
1973-74	Dr. George Sanderlin, Professor of English, San Diego State University Dr. Ann Stanford, Professor of English, California State University, Northridge
1974-75	Dr. Carmelo Gariano, Professor of Spanish, California State University, Northridge Dr. Janet Turner, Professor of Art, California State University, Chico

There have been overall, since the inception of the program, approximately 150 nominations and twenty-six awards. Some thought is now being given to publishing a widely distributed annual report in booklet form with appropriate recognition to all of the nominees, as well as the two final selectees. Consideration is also being given to an appropriate means of assisting campuses with information about the mechanics of submission -- volume, format, organization, quality control. Systemwide committees have regularly noted the unevenness in presentations with respect to organization, coverage, and bulk.

As indicated in the individual campus reports, on several campuses the nominee for the Outstanding Professor Award is given local recognition, including honoraria.

II. DISTINGUISHED TEACHING AWARDS

The Distinguished Teaching Award program, though it is no longer operational in the system, deserves notice and description in this context. During its active period of five years (1965-1970) it was often associated with, and on the campuses even incorrectly confused with, the Outstanding Professor Awards program.

Beyond the perhaps natural tendency to associate, and to fail to distinguish, two systemwide award programs for faculty, both the origin and the operation of the two contributed to the confusion.

The close historical association of the two awards is observable in the following discussion of and text of a resolution adopted unanimously by the Board of Trustees at its meeting of September 6, 1963:

> **Selection of Outstanding Faculty Members for Awards For Teaching Excellence.** Mr. Heilbron stated that there is total agreement that the teaching functions are paramount in the state college system. It will be helpful, in emphasizing these functions and in improving the teaching program, to make awards recognizing teaching excellence. The California State College Foundation has received a sum of $2,500 which might be available to initiate such a program. Successful award programs now exist in some of the leading colleges and universities of the United States.
>
> **ACTION:** Upon a motion by Mr. Coblentz, seconded by Mr. Ruffo, a waiver of the rules was unanimously approved.
>
> **ACTION:** Upon motion by Mr. Heilbron, seconded by Mr. Coblentz, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:
>
> > **RESOLVED**, By the Trustees of the California State Colleges, that the Chancellor be requested to study the procedure and criteria for making awards for excellence in teaching in the several State Colleges; and
> >
> > **RESOLVED** further, That the Presidents and faculties of the Colleges be consulted in the development of such procedures and criteria; and
> >
> > **RESOLVED** further, That the award procedure should include provision for participation of students, as well as faculty; and
> >
> > **RESOLVED** further, That the Trustees request the California State College Foundation to make available the sum of $2,500 for the purpose of initiating and implementing this policy.

The last resolved clause is simply the initial implementing action by the Board to begin the Outstanding Professor Awards program. It would appear that the Trustees had in mind a single program – to be initiated by the moneys provided to the CSUC Foundation by the Schenk Foundation and to be continued under arrangements and guidelines proceeding from the study by the Chancellor requested and described in resolved clauses 1-3.

It was entirely possible that *only* the Outstanding Professor Awards program would have developed from this resolution. As it turned out, however, the Schenk-funded awards continued under procedures and guidelines developed under the Chancellor's direction, *and*, as a result of the efforts of his office pursuant to the resolution, the Legislature in the 1965-66 Budget Act appropriated funds sufficient to underwrite nearly sixty $500 awards for CSUC faculty – fifteen times the total dollar capacity of the Schenk-funded program.

Thereafter the Distinguished Teaching Awards, as they were designated, were thought of as arising indirectly out of the initial September 1963 Board action. For example, the "Introduction" to the 1968-69 publication presenting that year's distinguished teachers quotes the text of the 1963 Board resolution and clearly implies that the teaching awards described in the booklet proceeded from that action.

The record indicates, therefore, that the Board resolution, rather clearly based on the conception of *a* program of awards, actually resulted in the birth of two separate programs.

A reason for the confusion of the two programs other than their common matrix was the tendency of campuses to merge the processes of nomination for the two. Perhaps mainly for purposes of efficiency, campuses tended to have one selection committee and one set of procedures for both programs; they concentrated on the more locally oriented distinguished teacher selection and simply sent forward the name of one of the local winners as the outstanding professor nomination. This merging of the programs explains the paragraph in the 1966 and subsequent year requests from the Chancellor's Office for outstanding professor nominations:

> Each college should determine for itself whether to confine their nomination(s) for this award to those nominated on their campus for the new teaching awards or to broaden the competition, since the criteria for the outstanding professor awards are somewhat broader in concept than the teaching awards.

It is noteworthy that the two awards, confused as they were by origin and methods of selection, became somewhat differentiated. The teaching award presumably concentrated on the teaching function; the outstanding professor award gave relatively more attention to the functions of research, publication and creative production, professional activity, and service to campus and society. The two awards were, therefore, technically distinguishable, and the campuses were "allowed," if not encouraged, to distinguish them. But in practice the various relative mixes of emphases on teaching performance *per se* and the other professorial functions achieved by the campuses in the general period of 1965-70 do not present a picture of clear distinction of professor as distinguished teacher and professor as outstanding professor. There is some evidence, as can be observed in the individual campus sections of this report, that the campuses did move toward separating the two competitions. Of course, since the discontinuation of state support for the Distinguished Teaching Awards, to the extent that the teaching awards are continued, they are without monetary component or the moneys attached to them are raised locally from private resources. This has served to distinguish them fairly completely.

It is nevertheless clear that the Board of Trustees in 1963 intended the awards they had in mind to emphasize the teaching function. In introducing the resolution to the Board, Trustee Louis Heilbron stated "... that there is total agreement that the teaching functions are paramount in the state college system. It will be helpful, in emphasizing these functions and in improving the teaching program, to make awards recognizing teaching excellence." The subsequent Board resolution, adopted by unanimous vote specified "awards for excellence in teaching."

The emphasis on teaching with respect to the Distinguished Teaching Awards is reflected in the introduction to the 1965-66 formal brochure announcing the recipients of the awards in that first year of the program:

> This program, as it was developed by the Board of Trustees of the California State Colleges, the Office of the Chancellor, and the faculties and the administrations of the individual campuses, reflects the belief that teaching is a profession of vast social and personal importance. Furthermore, the awards program reflects the desire to recognize effective teaching as a prime function of higher education and to encourage interest in effective teaching throughout the system.

As noted heretofore, in the next budget cycle after the September 1963 resolution of the Board of Trustees, funding for a program of distinguished teaching awards was requested. As a consequence, in the Budget Act for 1965-66 the California State Legislature established the awards program by appropriating sufficient funds to give a $500 honorarium to each professor selected as a distinguished teacher on his/her campus. The number of awards was determined by campus on the basis of one for every 2,000 full-time equivalent students enrolled at the campus. This formula was later changed to a ratio of one award to every 199 FTE faculty on a campus.

In the first year of the program a total of 57 awards was granted on fifteen campuses. The new and small campuses at Dominguez Hills, San Bernardino, and Sonoma did not participate in the initial year. The number of recipients per campus ranged from one (on one campus) to six (on three campuses).

Procedures for the selection of the Distinguished Teachers were determined locally on each of the participating campuses. College committees representing a cross section of campus perspectives established criteria, received nominations for the awards, and set the procedures for the selection of award winners.

It is interesting to note that the 1968-69 Distinguished Teaching Award publication summarized the criteria and procedures being employed, college by college, with the somewhat wistful comment that "By sharing these provisions, the various colleges may compare and reassess their standards for determining and demonstrating the qualifications of a distinguished teacher."

The summary in 1968-69 does reveal considerable differences in approach among the colleges with respect to both criteria and procedures. For example, requirements for eligibility to be considered for the award vary greatly from campus to campus. One college required only that the nominee be "any member of the faculty." Another required "full-time with at least half-time assignment in teaching." Another required a current teaching load minimum of twelve units. Yet another specified a minimum length of prior service, prospect of continuation, and restrictions as to the period of elapsed time since receipt of an earlier award.

Nomination methods usually included students, alumni, and faculty. Some employed simple requests for consideration, some petitions with a minimum number of signatures, and some student polls. In some instances student and alumni participation was limited by specifying such things as "graduates of the last three years" or "graduate students, graduating seniors, and juniors."

Most of the selection committees were composed of faculty and the great majority were selected by, and tied closely to, the local faculty senate or council. There appears a clear tendency to include by design former winners as committee members. In some instances students and alumni were members of the committee; in one case the total of four alumni and student members outnumbered the faculty membership on the committee.

As a rule, selections were made on a campuswide basis, but on two of the campuses awards appear to have been allocated in advance for determination by schools or combinations of schools.

There was less apparent variety in the use of criteria related to teaching performance. Most lists of published criteria included reference in some form to knowledge of subject matter, selection and organization of materials, systematic preparation and presentation, ability to communicate, and enthusiasm. Some stress was placed on "innovation" – "new and creative methods," "new teaching techniques" and "new, major modifications in course content." The so-called "research" component appeared often in different guises – "continued interest in and contributions to his field" and "scholarship, research, and professional activities." One or two required "encouragement of discussion," urging of "individual thinking," "imparting more than simply informational aspects of

the subject," or active "interest in his students and their progress." Interestingly, only two mention evaluation of student performance, and the clearest of them simply calls for "fair and consistent evaluation."

The Distinguished Teaching Award programs was tied closely with an effort officially entitled The Faculty Publications Program. It is interesting to note that the familiar teaching-scholarship dichotomy emerges again here. In the context of distinguished teaching, a program to recognize and publicize the scholarly productions of distinguished teachers was begun. Each budget request for the teaching awards contained a line for the publications project. For example, in the attempt to restore the awards in the 1971-72 budget, the Trustees requested $56,000 for 112 awards and $54,000 for the publication portion.

The purpose of the publications program was officially stated thus:

> The scholarly works of distinguished teachers, plus selected materials of other faculty members judged to be of sufficient interest and value for the recognition and improvement of teaching, are produced through the related [to Distinguished Teaching Awards] Publications Program.

In November 1966 the Chancellor's Office appointed a Committee on State College Publications, which set to work immediately establishing editorial policies and developing procedures for submission of manuscripts. Each year recipients of the Distinguished Teaching Award were encouraged to submit any publishable material they had on hand for review by the Publications Committee.

Under the auspices of this committee there was published in May 1969 a book entitled *Napoleon III and the Working Class: Government Propaganda Under the Second Empire*, by Dr. David Kulstein, Professor of History at San Jose State. This was followed in 1970 by publication of *The Short Novels of Herman Melville* by Dr. Kingsley Widmer, Professor of English at San Diego State. In addition, the program sponsored and published the *American Literature Abstracts*, a system-edited semi-annual review of current scholarship on American Literature.

State funding of both efforts, the teaching awards and publications, was discontinued in 1970 when the Legislature deleted the item from the Governor's Budget. There had been some negative reactions to the teaching awards on some campuses – allegations of "politics" in selection, uneasiness about picking only five dozen or so recipients from among thousands of faculty members, and no doubt differences of judgment as to who should and should not have received them. In 1968-69 there were fifty-seven awards, but two campuses (two of those not now nominating for the Outstanding Professor Awards) were no longer involved. However, it does not appear that those internal disjunctures contributed directly to the demise of the programs. 1970 was a year of "cut, squeeze, and trim" in state budgeting. In that same 1970-71 budget the Legislature also deleted all salary increases for faculty and all the special so-called Chancellor's "creative leaves" and increased the sabbatical leave ratio to the current 1:12. The teaching awards and publication efforts simply were cut, and there came to an end the state support for the most extensive awards program the system ever had – an end to the greater part of the Trustees' intentions for an effective method of outright awards for excellence in teaching. The Trustees sought restitution of both the awards and the publication program in the 1971-72 budget, but that request did not even get into the Governor's Budget.

The individual campus reports show that several of the campuses have continued the teaching awards either with local, private funds or on an honor-without-honoraria basis.

III. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AWARDS

At its May 25-26, 1976 meeting the Board of Trustees adopted a recommendation of the CSUC Ad Hoc Committee on the Procurement and Retention of a Quality Faculty which provides for a system of Professional Service Awards designed to "reward excellence and encourage continued professional growth."

Under the terms of this program, each campus would be authorized to award a number of Professional Service Fellowships equivalent in cost to 2% of its total faculty salary allocation. Appointments would be made on an annual basis, renewable only once for a total of two appointments within any given seven-year period. All full-time CSUC faculty would be eligible for nomination and appointment. Applications or nominations for such appointments could be made by faculty, students, or academic administrators. Each application would contain a proposal for some developmental scholarly or professional activity during the term of the fellowship. The process of selection and appointment would be carried out within existing campus structures for personnel decision-making in such areas as retention, tenure, and promotion.

In addition to the professional recognition such appointments would naturally imply, each appointment would provide a grant of up to $5,000 in funds and/or assigned weighted teaching units in support of the appointees' proposed scholarly and professional activities during the term of the appointment.

Hence, the fellowships are at once in part a recognition of excellent performance and in part the means of further professional development.

Using the 1975-76 instructional budget as a basis for calculation, the program would authorize a total systemwide subscription of $4,851,290. Individual campus allocations would range from the Stanislaus low of $57,299 to the San Diego high of $471,040. These funds, required to underwrite both monetary grants and reimbursements for assigned time, will be requested as a Program Change Proposal in the Trustees' 1977-78 budget submission.

This Board of Trustee proposal is the culmination of several years of activity aimed at providing some special reward for excellence of performance among faculty.

The original Ad Hoc Committee on the Procurement and Retention of a Quality Faculty was first convened in late 1969. In September 1970 the Board of Trustees adopted Part I of the Committee's recommendations, which dealt with the need for written campuswide procedures on faculty appointments, reappointments, tenure, promotions and merit salary adjustments. In January 1971 came the Board adoption of Part II, which addressed the issues of the criteria and evidence used in making personnel decisions and certain departmental administrative matters related to selection and retention of faculty.

Section 1.f. of Part I of the Committee's report called for periodic evaluations of faculty performance after tenure. The recommendation was based on the observation that, aside from review for promotion after the granting of tenure, there appeared to be no formal periodic peer evaluations of tenured professors. The original intent of the 1970 recommendation and evaluation was to establish a system of performance review and evaluation after tenure, but the proposal lacked any provision for positive incentives or rewards for continued professional development and improving performance. As a result, it was generally viewed by faculty as negative, and possibly punitive, in application. It should be observed that the notion of "post-tenure review," as it is commonly referred to, is generally regarded with suspicion among faculty in the CSUC system even though evaluation feedback can be a very positive component of professional growth.

Faculty leaders, notably then Academic Senate Chairman Vern Graves and Faculty Affairs Chairman Charles Adams, reached an informal agreement with Trustees William Weissich and Guy Warren (the Trustee members on the Ad Hoc Committee) that attempts to make that recommendation operational should await the implementation of a new salary schedule which had been adopted by the Board in 1970. Indeed, the Ad Hoc Committee had been deliberating during the same period that another systemwide task force had been developing the proposed new salary schedule, and the committees were somewhat overlapping in membership.

The so-called "1970 Salary Schedule" included three additional steps for each rank, and thus, especially in the establishment of Steps 5, 7, and 8 for professors and a system of peer evaluation for faculty eligible to move to those steps, provided a context for regular peer evaluation of tenured full professors and a system of *rewards* in the form of step movement and concomitant salary increases.

The new schedule languished for two years without any hint of funding though attempts were made both in the budget and by separate legislation to underwrite it. Then, the 1972-73 Budget Act provided $3.1 million for academic salary adjustments to remove "inequities." $1.2 million were allocated for miscellaneous adjustments and the Board of Trustees resolved in July 1972 to implement *partially* the new salary schedule with the remaining $1.9 million. Had that resolution been carried out, periodic performance review after tenure would have been established at a fairly active level with some monetary reward possible in the form of salary step increments.

Faculty leaders objected that the new salary schedule represented a bargain in which there was a significant "trade-off" of faculty submission to a rather intensive degree of periodic review for a reasonable potential for achievement of reward. Though it was admittedly difficult to determine how much would be required to administer the new schedule at a reasonable level, one bill designed by the Chancellor's staff to implement the schedule (carried by Assemblyman Warren) had requested first-year funding of $4.5 million. Hence, the $1.9 million appeared on all sides adequate only to partial implementation. There was, moreover, no assurance of requisite additional funding in subsequent years. At length, after a great deal of controversy and skirmishing, the implementation was blocked by the intervention of an influential legislator and his assertions of "legislative intent" in the initial appropriation of the "inequity funding."

The Board of Trustees established a second Ad Hoc Committee on Procurement and Retention of a Quality Faculty at its meeting of September 25, 1974. This committee began with a review and analysis of the recommendations of its predecessor. In late 1975 the Committee made its report to the Board, which contained twenty-seven recommendations, some of which were reaffirmations of recommendations of the earlier committee, others of which were modifications of earlier recommendations, and yet others of which were new recommendations responsive to broader and more recent issues.

In reaction to the 1970 recommendation of periodic evaluations after tenure and the aborted attempts to realize them, the committee concluded that "a program of evaluation of tenured full professors should be established which would permit tangible recognition of merit and excellence" which would be "voluntary and at the option of the affected professors."

The method suggested required peer evaluation leading to recommendations of merit step increases for a limited number of professors to three salary steps beyond the five steps currently provided.

All professors occupying Steps 5, 6 or 7 for at least three years could request consideration for movement to the next step. Failure to achieve movement upon such a request would make the requestor ineligible to reapply during the next two academic years. The maximum number of occupants of each of the "extended" steps was based on a percentage of full professors at Step 5 – 20% at Step 6, 10% at Step 7, 5% at Step 8. The maximum annual cost of the program, which would not be reached until 1987-88, was calculated at 1974-75 salary rates to be $3.3 million.

This recommendation, Recommendation #24, was opposed by the Academic Senate, which proposed that equivalent moneys be spent on leaves and grants instead of percentage salary increases. Concerns were expressed about "super-professor" status, about the limited access to the extra steps and about the impact of the salary levels' additional steps on general salary increase requests.

IV. A SURVEY OF CAMPUS-BASED AWARDS

INTRODUCTION

The following reports of "award" activities on the individual campuses within the system are likely to be "incomplete" in the sense that they are not "exhaustive." A project to assure notice of all awards and programs in individual schools and departments would require a much more extensive and time-consuming survey conducted under somewhat different circumstances from those of this late May-June attempt.

In the overwhelming majority of cases, the campus report is based on a personal or telephone interview with the President or Academic Vice President or, as in a few instances, both of these key administrators. Leads to other administrators and faculty suggested by these "primary" informants were followed up. The material was written up and circulated back to campus representatives of the Policy Board of the Center for Professional Development for a check on accuracy. The members of the Board are listed in Appendix A.

If they are not exhaustive, the reports should at least highlight those efforts sufficiently well known on campus to have surfaced in the interviews.

The Outstanding Professor Awards are usually alluded to only where they are locally proscribed or become the basis of further recognition.

It is difficult to limit comment to programs which are purely awards for past performance as distinguished from awards of grants which are based in part, even in large part, on proposals for future performance. Moreover, when the distinction is broken down, it is even more difficult to decide which programs to include and which to exclude. This report has generally included all efforts suggested by campus informants as fitting the framework of "awards, special recognition, official encouragement" of faculty for "doing their thing."

Programs common to all the campuses, such as the Chancellor's Office Division of New Program Development and Evaluation's (NPD&E) mini-grant program, are referred to only when there is a special connection between them and other local grant efforts or when they are administered locally in a noteworthy unusual fashion.

BAKERSFIELD

Five or six years ago this campus provided, for one year only, two awards for two outstanding faculty members. The recipients were selected by a campus committee, the majority of whom were faculty; each selectee received an honorarium of $500 drawn from local campus foundation funds.

Under the rubric of the Grant-Related Instructional Faculty program, the campus has established two positions. One was used last year for an established member of the regular faculty. The current plan is to continue that appointment during 1975-76 and use the other to underwrite a distinguished visiting professor. The campus sees the grant-related appointments as having three basic uses: retention of high-quality faculty who may be enticed by attractive offers to move, recruitment of excellent faculty who otherwise would not come to Bakersfield, and the invitation of distinguished visiting professors for term appointments.

The campus also is using money from the Joyce Pelletier Foundation to fund a rotating, part-time visiting professorship in the fine arts. This may be as much as half-time for the academic year or full-time for a semester.

CHICO

The Chico campus participates in the Outstanding Professor Awards program; one of the recipients each of the last two years has been nominated from the Chico faculty.

The campus does not have any program of outright awards for excellence or unusual performance of normal professorial functions.

Chico does have, however, an extensive arrangement for small grants for proposals designed to improve the educational programs of the University. Several resources are combined to underwrite this effort. Proposals which have something of a local or regional flavor are diverted for review at least initially by the Foundation, the Alumni Association, and the Chico State Associates. The mini-grant funds from the Chancellor's Office of New Program Development and Evaluation comprise a part of the resources for this program.

Perhaps the most unusual aspect of the funding of this effort is the fact that the campus, with the support of the Faculty Senate, initially sets aside one percent of its funds and positions to be used for purposes of educational improvement.

A campuswide call for proposals is distributed to all academic employees in the fall. Early in the spring semester the applications are reviewed by a committee, the majority of whose members are teaching faculty. This committee inquires and negotiates details as necessary, and decides which projects should be funded and from which type of resource.

The upper limit for requests is $2,500, but the call for applications encourages an "average request" of approximately $1,000. For 1976-77 six positions and $30,000 were available. Forty-two applications were submitted.

The campus tries to commit all of the state mini-grant money available; in the case of Chico, approximately $10,000. What is not committed of the one percent of campus budgeted funds and positions is returned to the campus "pot" for distribution among the academic units.

DOMINGUEZ HILLS

At each spring commencement this campus gives special recognition to three faculty members chosen for their outstanding teaching. One of these is that year's campus nominee in the systemwide Outstanding Professor Award competition. He/she receives an honorary plaque. The other two receive, in addition to the plaque, honoraria of $250 each.

The two recipients of the honoraria are nominated by members of the campus community, usually by departmental faculty, in response to a campuswide announcement of the competition and call for nominations. Nominees are reviewed by the Honors and Awards Committee of the Faculty, and recommendations of the committee are transmitted to the president. The funds for the honoraria come from a general fund for Faculty which is supported by subscriptions from business and other groups in the community.

The Student Association at this campus has on an irregular basis run its own competition and honored one Outstanding Teacher for the year. This entirely student-initiated and operated program has been sporadic in its implementation.

The Foundation at Dominguez Hills is young and small, but will within a few years be able to underwrite special faculty projects. It is expected that within two years it may be able to match the mini-grant program now underwritten by NPD&E.

FRESNO

This campus has several awards for excellence in teaching, but they are associated with schools rather than the entire University. The School of Agricultural Science, for example, gives an annual award within that unit in the form of a $1,500 honorarium. The School of Business gives several awards (30-40) to both faculty and students at an annual awards dinner; these are objectified mainly by plaques and certificates. This School also gives several project awards on the basis of application reviews; the funds for the awards are raised by private donations to the Office of Business Research. According to the information gathered, most of the schools have a teaching award in some form.

The only University-wide recognition aside from the nomination in the Outstanding Professor Award competition is the Alumni Award for Outstanding Contribution to the University. Though the award can go to members of the campus community other than faculty, members of the faculty can and have received it. The recipient is given special recognition at commencement. The entire selection process is handled by the Alumni Association.

Fresno is in its second year of a planned five-year drive to attract outside funds to help faculty directly. It secured the services of consultants to assist in mapping the course for this effort. The "first fruits" of this approach are the allocations by the president to the deans of the schools of private funds to be given as grants to faculty "to do whatever the school faculty wish to do with them." Last year some of the school allocations amounted to as much as $300.

FULLERTON

This campus has emphasized and embellished in several ways its participation in the systemwide Outstanding Professor Awards program. The truly unique feature of the campus process, recently introduced, is the selection of the nominee in the academic year preceding the year in which the name is submitted systemwide. This clearly avoids the timing problem several of the campuses seem to have each year in completing the local phases of the process between late November and early March.

The person selected as Outstanding Professor at the campus (the next year's systemwide nominee) is, in the year of his/her selection, recognized at commencement. In addition, at the Honors Banquet that year he/she is given a $100 honorarium by the president – the only award given at the banquet to anyone other than students. The honorarium comes from private funds made available by a local university support group known as the Friends of the University.

During the following fall semester the selectee is scheduled for a university lecture on a topic in his/her academic field. At the occasion of the lecture, the president or his designee gives the lecturer a $200 honorarium underwritten by another university support group – the President's Associates.

In addition, at the time of the initial announcement of the recipient, the Public Relations Office prepares a suitable press release, with a picture, for the media. This is invariably picked up and given "quite a play" in the community.

The Fullerton campus also has a grant program underwritten by private moneys called the Professional Encouragement Fund. In the academic year 1976-77 it will disburse approximately $10,000 in small grants for research, travel, and publication costs. The two sources of funds are the Friends of the University (approximately $2,000) and the President's Associates (approximately $8,000). Of the latter fund, $2,000 is specifically earmarked for travel. The total amount for next year is dramatically larger than it has been in previous years; it has averaged heretofore about $3,000 annually. It is anticipated locally that the fund will continue to grow. One noteworthy aspect of this program is that, in spite of the relatively large total amount available, the individual grants are relatively small – averaging heretofore about $50 and probably rising this year to approximately

$75 to $100. The operating principle appears to be to spread the funds in modest amounts to a larger number of applicants. Applications are made in one-half to one-page prospectuses. These are reviewed by a faculty committee under the direction of the Vice President for Administrative Services, who has general administrative responsibility for the program. The faculty committee is a well-established one, which was initially organized to recommend on the disbursement of federal moneys. The Professional Encouragement Fund was at one time basically a dispenser of NSF moneys; it now deals entirely with private funds.

HAYWARD

This campus does not have a campuswide award for faculty, but several of the schools do. The extraordinary characteristic of awards on the campus is the fact that they are for the most part initiated and carried out by students. For example, the School of Science Student Council annually honors the professor in the field of science who has "made the greatest contribution" within the year. In the School of Business, the student organization chooses an outstanding teacher in business for the year and gives recognition to him/her at its annual banquet. The honorary society in Speech conducts a process for selecting the Outstanding Teacher of the Year campuswide (not just in Speech). Nominations are solicited campuswide. Interestingly, the selection committee *visits the classes* of nominees as part of the selection process. These programs are carried out fairly regularly, but now and again, through default in current student leadership in the affected areas, the activity is neglected.

Hayward also has one of the most active levels of participation in the coursework fee waiver program for faculty and staff.

HUMBOLDT

For some time after the discontinuation of state funding for the Distinguished Teaching Awards, the campus continued the program with honoraria taken from the local campus foundation. The program was discontinued after the Faculty Senate decided it did not wish to participate.

The campus continues to nominate one faculty member annually for the Outstanding Professor Awards. This nominee is given a local honorarium of $500 regardless of how he/she may fare in the systemwide competition. The selection is also marked by considerable publicity on the campus and in the community.

Foundation moneys are also used to fund several grants annually for proposals to improve the educational program of the campus. Each grant is for not more than $500. The program is known on campus as the local "mini-grant" program.

LONG BEACH

This campus currently does not participate in the Outstanding Professor Awards competition. The campus Academic Senate annually votes formally to decline response to the systemwide call for nominations. However, a committee of the Academic Senate is reviewing the traditional stand and will submit its report during the 1976-77 academic year.

Long Beach has submitted a plan for possible implementation of a program of Grant-Related Instructional Classes – the privately funded extended salary range program now used only by Bakersfield. The campus is thus only the second to attempt approval of a local plan for implementation; it does not now have funds "in hand" for initiation of the plan, but it is laying the groundwork in the event that moneys become available.

Funds from the University Foundation and those taken "from the top" of the university operating expense (OE) allocation form the base of a grant program totaling some $35,000. The portion from the Foundation ranges annually from $10,000 to $15,000; the OE source produces $20,000. The purpose of the program is to stimulate instructional innovation, research related to instruction, and some of what may be regarded more as subject matter research. Applications are made to the Office of the Academic Vice President. All applications are reviewed by a faculty screening committee appointed by the Academic Senate, which makes recommendations. The final decision on grants is made by the President or his designee. The grant amounts usually range from $500 to $1,000, but they have on occasion approached $2,000.

Related to the skimming of OE is the setting aside of some twenty-seven instructional positions for use as "assigned time" for research and instructionally related assignments within departments. Seven positions are given to the Graduate Dean to underwrite research projects. Twenty are allocated to the Academic Vice President for use in the several other schools. The campus administration stresses the importance of having these positions in a separate "pot." Departments are reluctant to give assigned time from their own allocations, even for demonstrably important functions, in the immediate context of departmental fiscal constraints. Just the atmosphere of the possibility of drawing on "external" resources, even though those initially diminish to some degree unit resources, is said to have a catalytic effect on willingness to give special assignments.

During 1975-76 a Teaching-Learning Fair was sponsored by the Center for Faculty Development. The event featured exhibits of 27 faculty members and included various instructional approaches and materials developed by those receiving instructional grants. There appears to have been considerable stimulus for exhibitors and for visiting faculty.

LOS ANGELES

For the last fourteen years this campus has annually given its own Outstanding Professor Awards to faculty members; in recent years the number has ranged from four to six per year. Selection is made by a committee established by the Faculty Senate. The same committee chooses the nominee for the systemwide Outstanding Professor Award, but the processes of selection for the campus and system awards are kept distinct. The committee receives nominations, reviews the records of those nominated, and makes its choices. Recognition is given the recipients at the first general faculty meeting of the academic year. Individual commemorative plaques are given and the names of those honored are inscribed on a large "cumulative" plaque which is displayed in the university library. In this connection, it is interesting to note that this library plaque is being moved to a more prominent place as the result of a suggestion made recently by students, who thought it was not displayed properly for optimal exposure. The awards also involve a monetary stipend taken from funds provided by the Foundation and the Alumni Association. These honoraria vary in amount from year to year, but recently they have ranged in the neighborhood of $250 each. A dispute has arisen as to the availability of personnel records to representatives of the Alumni Association. The Faculty Senate has recommended against access, and the offended Association may not participate monetarily, which could reduce the total available moneys to $700.

There appears to be little done by way of awards in academic units within the University, though from time to time the students in the School of Business have given awards to distinguished faculty. This is done apparently sporadically, depending upon the student leadership at the time.

NORTHRIDGE

This campus has been one of the most active, and the second most successful, in terms of numbers of recipients, in the Outstanding Professor Award competition.

Additionally, the campus has continued the Distinguished Teaching Awards with Foundation funding. Each year the campus selects four or five faculty members to share the $2,000 in awards;

hence, each honoree receives four or five hundred dollars. Each is also recognized at commencement. Nominations for consideration for the teaching award are made by graduating seniors and faculty members. A select committee of faculty members, whose identity is kept confidential, receives nominations and investigates the qualifications of nominess. This process is supervised entirely by the President of the Faculty; the university administration is not directly involved.

Northridge also gives two annual awards of approximately $500 for outstanding scholarly contributions during the academic year of the award; one is for noteworthy written production and one for a superior creative production. The honoraria are made available by the President's Club. Faculty members apply for consideration, and the selections are made by a faculty committee, the composition of which is kept secret. The recipients are honored at the annual banquet of the sponsoring President's Club.

This campus operates a program known as the Institute for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning. At the heart of the program is the appointment of fifteen faculty fellows each year, with approximately half the number being chosen each semester so that terms overlap.

The fellows are appointed for one-year terms, though reappointment is possible. The basic criteria for selection are commitment to teaching and amenability to new ideas. Nominations are made initially by departments; all departments may nominate one or more and most departments do participate, though not all do. On an average there are thirty nominations each year. The names are transmitted by the president to the director of the Institute, who has a review mechanism by means of which the final selections are made. Under the general terms of the program, fellows could be faculty members who need special assistance in their professional development, but thus far they have as a rule been distinguished, established faculty.

POMONA

This campus appears to have had the first Distinguished Teaching Awards program – even before state funds were available for them. Each year, since the early 1960's Pomona has chosen three distinguished teachers. At first, cash awards were made from local money garnered by the campus foundation; later the honoraria came from the systemwide state-funded Distinguished Teaching Awards program; since the demise of the latter, the selection process has continued with recognition, but no money component. Nominations are made, after a campuswide notice, by faculty, administration, students, and/or alumni. Selection of the recipients is made by a committee of the campus Faculty Senate. The announcement of the selectees is made in the spring at the annual Senior Breakfast. From thirty to forty faculty members serve breakfast to the graduating seniors on that occasion. Usually the recipients of the award are among this group, thinking as they attend that they are present only to serve. At an appropriate time they are announced and presented with plaques by the President of the University. Last year plaques were given retroactively to all previous recipients, who in early years had received only scrolls as momentos (with or without honoraria).

At one time this teaching award process was merged with the selection of the campus nominee for the systemwide Outstanding Professor Award competition, but the two selections, though both superintended by the Faculty Senate, are kept separate.

In several of the schools within the University there is recognition annually of an Outstanding Professor of the Year.

SACRAMENTO

The Faculty Senate on this campus routinely declines each year to participate in the systemwide Outstanding Professor Awards program. The Senate does, however, have a Research Committee which is active in choosing annually an Outstanding Scholar and reviewing and selecting applications for "research-writing" grants totaling several thousands of dollars.

Since 1961 the campus has given each year (except 1971, when the decision was made that no nominee actually measured up) an honorarium to an Outstanding Scholar. The award carries a $1,000 stipend given by the University Foundation to the Research Committee for the purpose. In 1975-76 the award was divided between two recipients in what the Committee regarded as a competitive "tie." Nominations are customarily made by faculty members, not uncommonly by the department chair or by departmental action. It is possible for one to nominate himself, but such an action is not common. The number of candidates for the award has varied annually over a range of eight to fifteen. The Research Committee receives the nominations, reviews the scholarly record of the nominees, and makes its decision. The choice is based strictly on past performance. It is not tied to a proposed project.

The University Foundation also makes available to the Research Committee approximately $25,000 a year for research-writing grants. Though there is no set limit on the amount of one of these grants, announcements of their availability indicate that they have in the past averaged close to $1,000 each. Applications are made directly to the Research Committee, which apportions the funds. The Foundation funds for this purpose come from private donations and National Science Foundation (NSF) allocations. The relative portion of the fund supplied by NSF is gradually diminishing and the portion from local sources is proportionately increasing. Because of the NSF involvement, there has tended to be some emphasis on the "hard sciences." These grants are used for a variety of purposes: purchasing equipment, materials for research, travel necessary to investigations, student and other personal assistance in projects. A few larger equipment purchases have been amortized over more than one year, requiring a series of annual allocations. Though typing services can be paid for from these funds, thus far the committee has not been willing to underwrite the "page cost" fees charged by some scholarly journals, but it is actively considering a change in that policy.

SAN BERNARDINO

This campus does not participate in the Outstanding Professor Awards program. Each year the president presents the possibility to the campus Faculty Senate in conjunction with the call for nominations. Last year, as in years past, the group refused to become involved in the process of nomination.

Each year the President makes available to the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate approximately $1,500 to $2,000 from a campus privately donated fund called the President's Club Fund. The committee receives applications for grants from the fund and apportions the sum among the projects it chooses. Normally the allocations do not exceed $200. The purposes are quite broad – any study, research, or professional activity on which the professor may wish financial help. There are always more requests than money available; the competition for the grants is "quite lively."

SAN DIEGO

This campus has had more recipients of the systemwide Outstanding Professor Award than any other campus – a total of six. The annual nominee for the systemwide Outstanding Professor competition is recognized at commencement, in a ceremony by the University Faculty Senate, and in extensive local publicity.

The University also seeks out other special faculty teaching and research efforts for funding. Twice a year the Teaching and Learning Council solicits and funds proposals aimed at improving instruction, developing curriculum, and strengthening departmental teaching efforts. Both Chancellor's Office Mini-Grant funds and local funds support this program.

Each year the campus makes available approximately ten Summer Fellowships with a stipend of $2,000 each. The competition for these grants is intense. They are given for research in the recipient's academic discipline. The idea is to encourage the academic use of the summer recess and to allow some faculty to do research freed from the pressure to take summer employment. Funds for these grants come from the University Foundation – ultimately from private donations to the Foundation. Seven summer grants were awarded in 1976.

In addition to the summer fellowships, the University gives Faculty Research Grants for activity carried out during the academic year. Annually approximately $20,000 in such grants is awarded. This sum is divided almost evenly between two categories of grants – smaller ones for $500 or less and larger ones ranging from $500 to $2,500.

The University has a comprehensive system for evaluating applications for grants and recommending them for funding, including screening and signing off at the departmental and school/college level prior to submission to the all-University groups involved. The overall grant activity is supervised by a University Research Council, whose members are selected mainly by the Faculty Senate, with two appointees by the Graduate Dean. Individual competitions are overseen by subcommittees of this Research Council; the subcommittees usually overlap in membership somewhat with the parent Council, but to a lesser or greater extent subcommittees include non-Council members. For example, the Summer Fellowship applications are judged by a subcommittee of four distinguished professors and the Graduate Dean. From year to year, slight changes in focus or procedure are made; however, the basic intent – support for significant teaching and research efforts – remains the same.

SAN FRANCISCO

This campus does not participate in the Outstanding Professor Awards nomination process pursuant to a recommendation of the campus Faculty Senate. In 1973-74 the Senate sought to make the ban a standing policy, but the President insisted on making the matter one of annual decision.

The School of Business annually appoints a Visiting Distinguished Professor in Business. The appointments may be for as little time as two weeks or for as much as a full year. Normally the appointee teaches for one semester or two; the teaching load is the full twelve units. The salary, concomitant with the rank and step of the visitor's position, usually top step of full professor, is augmented by drawing on a $5,000 annually available fund from privately subscribed grants to the University. The appointee for 1975-76 is an economist from West Germany.

This campus also has available $25,000 annually from private funds to underwrite proposals for projects having to do generally with faculty development. The awards, with a limit of $1,000 each, are made upon the recommendation of the campus Faculty Development Committee.

Several moves are being made under the guise of faculty development in the allocations of state resources, funds and positions, pursuant to the new campus master plan. For example, a position in English has been earmarked for assigned time allocation to members of that department's faculty who manifest an interest in special development aimed at the teaching of composition.

SAN JOSE

The campus nominee at San Jose for the systemwide Outstanding Professor Award is given a plaque in a traditional ceremony at commencement.

Each year a faculty member is recognized as the President's Scholar. Though teaching performance is considered, the primary focus is on scholarship. The selection is made by a committee comprised of the school deans and faculty members chosen because of their recognition as scholars. The selectee is honored at a special faculty meeting held in late spring, usually April or May. At this meeeting, to which the public is invited, the honoree gives a scholarly address. A $250 honorarium accompanies the selection.

Other awards on campus are associated with the schools and other academic units. For example, the departments associated with public address choose an annual Outstanding Scholar in the field who is feted at a convocation usually attended by as many as three hundred invited guests. The School of Science annually gives a Dean's Award for Exemplary Teaching and a Dean's Award for Exemplary Research; these awards are often accompanied by a tangible token, such as the gift of expensive briefcases in 1975-76. The School of Business reportedly makes several honorary awards each year.

SAN LUIS OBISPO

This campus is continuing the Distinguished Teaching Award program in the absence of any available honoraria, either from state or local funds. Three faculty members are chosen annually by an *ad hoc* committee of the campus Academic Senate. One of the persons selected is ultimately the campus nominee for the systemwide Outstanding Professor Awards competition.

Though the recipients receive no honoraria, they are accorded considerable local recognition. They appear at the opening faculty conference in the fall. They are written up with pictures in the student newspaper, and not uncommonly are accorded similar publicity in the San Luis Obispo newspaper.

All full-time faculty members are eligible. Nominations are made by faculty members, alumni and students. The final choice is made by a Committee of the Academic Senate, which usually includes faculty members who have at one time or another themselves received the award.

SONOMA

This campus consistently declined to participate in the Outstanding Professor Award program until this past 1975-76 cycle. The same locally described "egalitarian spirit" has led to a general proscription of awards on the campus; there are none campuswide nor in the schools.

Sonoma has traditionally been very active, however, and consistently quite successful in competing for grants in such arenas as the annual systemwide NPD&E competitions. Activity in the quest of local mini-grants is "fierce."

The campus also stresses giving publicity and other personal recognition for achievements. The President and Academic Vice President routinely send letters of congratulation to faculty members who have been given some external recognition, have participated in a professional program, or have published a book or article. These letters are placed in the personnel files of those congratulated. Additionally, such accomplishments by faculty are announced in the Faculty-Staff Bulletin.

Until recently the College Foundation has provided a few grants for work with students, development of new teaching modes, and various research projects. Because of the shaky fiscal condition of the Foundation in the recent past, this grant program has been temporarily suspended, but it is anticipated that it will be reinstituted before long.

STANISLAUS

This campus has not submitted any nominations for the Outstanding Professor Award. There appears to be somewhat of a negative attitude toward competitions of that sort, though there is no set policy or overt action on record in opposition.

The Advisory Board of the college annually gives a Distinguished Service Award to a member of the campus community, though apparently thus far none has been given to a member of the faculty.

The campus does have an unusual program of summer grants. Moneys from a Foundation Account, ultimately contributed to the College from various business and other resources, are made available on application to faculty members for professional activity during the summer. Approximately $8,000 are distributed annually in grants, any one of which does not exceed $500. The grant may be used for travel associated with a professional objective (though obvious junkets are screened out), curriculum study, preparation of interdisciplinary programs, and "straight research." The fund has been helpful to younger faculty who can work on grants with some stipend in lieu of taking summer employment. The grants are made by the campus Council of Deans upon review of applications.

The campus Faculty Awards Committee, which is soon to be retitled "Faculty Leaves and Awards Committee," deals largely with leaves with pay, including difference-in-pay leaves. The Educational Policies Committee supervises the allocation of the systemwide NPD&E mini-grant funds. Both of these committees are a part of the campus Faculty Senate structure.

V. A COMMENTARY ON CRITERIA

GENERAL COMMENT ON CATEGORIES

In the majority of the foregoing subsections allusions have been made to the criteria employed in identifying honorees. It may be useful, however, to focus attention on that basic aspect of awards and honoraria in summary fashion.

Several times this report has referred in one way or another to the "teacher-scholar." This compound focuses on the two central functions which appear time and again in the documentation and discussion surrounding the various awards programs in The California State University and Colleges. In many cases the performance of the candidate as a teacher is the paramount consideration. In a few instances the status of the candidate as a productive scholar is the critical issue. In the vast majority of programs, however, some combination of teaching and scholarship is considered. The Distinguished Teaching Awards, in their earlier state-funded and currently locally supported forms, obviously stress the teaching function. Awards such as Sacramento State's Outstanding Scholar Award focus on scholarship rather exclusively. The systemwide Outstanding Professor Award criteria represent an attempt to evaluate in some depth both teaching and scholarship.

There is in this teaching-scholarship mix a dichotomy which surfaces repeatedly in almost every context related to the CSUC system – discussion and recommendations of the New Directions Commission, personnel decisions on campuses, deliberations of the Board of Trustees, and legislative hearings. The system has been identified both officially and informally as being comprised essentially of "teaching institutions." This designation in part is used to distinguish the CSUC from the University of California, which is assigned in the Master Plan the advanced graduate programs and, with them, the assumption of a proprietary right to the research activities associated with Ph.D. granting institutions. Inasmuch as "research" and "scholarship" are integrally related – in fact and in popular thinking – attempts to disregard and depress scholarship in the CSUC are numerous and widespread.

There is great reluctance on the part of state funding agencies, especially the legislature, to underwrite any program which appears to be research oriented. Even sabbaticals are regarded in some legislative circles as characteristic of "research" – as opposed to "teaching" – institutions. The recent addition of the word "University" to the titles of the system and a majority of its campuses appears to have aggravated official concern that latent interest in research on the part of CSUC faculty will somehow get out of control. Thus, budgets are scrutinized for the slightest evidence of what could be regarded as illegitimate preoccupation with scholarship. The one area in which this barrier appears to have been dented somewhat is loosely referred to as "instructionally related" research – and even this tends to be more practically experimental than "pure" and clearly more directed at pedagogical process than at subject matter.

Legislative chambers are not the only arenas in which the teaching-scholarship combination is the source of concern and confusion. It is very common in individual retention-promotion-tenure evaluations for committees and candidates to wrestle with the problem of proper proportions of the two for the decision being made. To a noteworthy extent this problem of proportions can be observed in the operation of the performance award programs described in this report. Just recently, for example, at least one Trustee expressed concern that the Outstanding Professor Award determinations seemed to be stressing research scholarship too much and teaching proportionately too little. For a while the continuation of the program appeared to be threatened. That threat has now subsided, but not without a resolution from the Board of Directors of the CSUC Foundation, which resolves that the Board "reemphasizes its desire to recognize excellence in teaching through the Outstanding Professor Award" and that the Board "requests the Chancellor to review, in

conjunction with the Statewide Academic Senate, the criteria used in the selection of the recipients of the "Outstanding Professor Awards to insure that the intent is met." A report of the review is requested for the January 1977 meeting of the Board – significantly timed to allow influence on the provision of the Schenk honoraria for the program.

Though there has been, is, and will probably continue to be, considerable disagreement as to the proportionate roles of teaching and scholarship in the performance of CSUC faculty, there appears to be general consensus that effective teaching requires faculty involvement in original research and the reporting of results. The extent to which this component in good teaching is emphasized varies from evaluation to evaluation and from institution to institution. This teaching-scholarship mix certainly varies from award to award among those programs now currently operating within the CSUC system.

In the context of the understanding that the relative emphasis of the two categories will vary among the several awards, the following discussion will attempt to discover the subcriteria considered in the granting of awards under the general headings of "effective teaching" and "scholarship."

TEACHING

Several criteria for juding teaching effectiveness recur in the published criteria lists and the discussions of criteria which were initiated by this survey. They tend to cluster in two categories – one having to do with the teacher and his/her function as instructor and the other focusing on the interaction of teacher and student. In the first category three considerations are listed or mentioned most frequently – knowledge of subject matter, the selection and sequential presentation of material, and amenability to new and creative methods of presentation. The element of subject matter knowledge is usually not elaborated upon or expressed in variant ways. That of selection and presentation is approached in several different ways: depth and breadth of coverage, unity and balance in the course, curriculum design, syllabus preparation, sequence and timing, flexibility in pacing, organization, judgment as to relevance, and sharing with students in advance a sense of the overall movement of the course. The criterion of "innovation" or "creativity" is usually expressed in terms of occasional references to "new approaches," "new teaching techniques," and "experimentation."

In addition to these three most frequently cited faculty-centered criteria, fairly numerous are allusions to "ability to communicate," "enthusiasm," and "activity in faculty and student affairs." Akin to the latter is the consideration of contributions to the campus and the community; occasionally these are separated and subdivided further into such subcategories as campus governance, departmental committee work, professional presentations on campus and in the community, and community service memberships and assignments. It should be emphasized that, though the criteria stressing campus and community activities outside the classroom are usually encountered in awards to "professors" in the generic sense of the term, they *do* appear in the description of awards designated as *teaching* awards. They tend to be of at least secondary emphasis where they appear; one suspects that they may be residuals of criteria lists used for more general purposes or vestiges of the notion that the "complete teacher" is necessarily active on campus and in community.

Criteria for effective teaching which are more student-centered include the teacher's stimulation of student interest; stress on individual thinking, provision for student point of view; and fair, consistent, timely, and personal evaluation of student performance. The two of these elements most frequently cited are "individual thinking" and "evaluation." The former is usually expressed in such a way as to emphasize the teacher's willingness to accept and value student points of view and conclusions which are not identical to, or congruent with, those of the instructor. With respect to evaluation, the concern shifts from one set of criteria to another – some stress fairness and

consistency, some timeliness, and a few the teacher's making the evaluation personally (as opposed to the use of assistants or surrogates). A few, but surprisingly few, awards also include as a criterion the availability of the instructor to students for advising or assistance.

SCHOLARSHIP

One basic component in the scholarship category of criteria for awards is "research" or "scholarly investigation." It represents an attempt to evaluate the candidate in terms of interest and involvement in the exploration and discovery of knowledge in a subject matter field – as distinguished from ability to master information already made available by others. Sometimes the term "original" occurs in this context, to underscore the idea of personal, creative involvement in the concepts, movements, and problems of the advancement of knowledge.

Inseparably related to investigation is the aspect of reporting – commonly referred to as "publication." Publications are considered to be evidence of the existence and quality of a candidate's investigative activity and a criterion in its own right for ascertaining worthiness for an award.

The descriptions of criteria under the general heading of scholarship usually reflect the realization that not all "scholarship" produces writing and that scholarly "products" other than writing should be taken into account. Creative performance, artistic production, and other measurable results of scholarly inquiry and professional activity are also overtly alluded to.

Closely related to scholarship, and sometimes included in it, are professional activities – extemporaneous speeches as well as papers read, attendance at and participation in professional meetings (such as being a panel member), consultancies, and service as an officer or creditable functionary in professional organizations. This kind of activity is sometimes referred to as "contribution to one's discipline." Research into and experimentation with teaching methods are often "counted" under the rubric of "scholarship" as much as under "teaching" for those outside the professional field of education. Some award programs require scholarship and professional contributions to be fairly current and sustained as opposed to their being somewhat dated and consisting of a single event.

PROMISE

Although many awards for excellence available to CSUC faculty are determined solely on the basis of the would-be recipient's past performance, not a few of them are awarded on the basis of a project proposal which is submitted as a key part of an application. Some of the awards, such as those in the proposed systemwide "Professional Service Awards," are based on a judgment of both past performance as teacher-scholar and a project proposal. The proposal itself may be evaluated in light of various criteria, depending on the nature of the award and the source of funding – creativity and innovation, relevance to the educational process, usefulness in interdisciplinary applications, regional implications, or applicability to special purposes, such as, for example the solution of environmental problems.

OTHER

Award determinations for the "professor" in the comprehensive sense of the term often take into account candidates' performance as citizens on the campus and in the community. Participation on committees, on faculty governance bodies, and even in key administrative roles are often recorded and counted in judging one's candidacy. Community service, both related and unrelated to one's professional capabilities, are also sometimes considered, though many competitions do not reflect evaluation of professionally unrelated activities.

EVIDENCE

In the above review of the criteria used in choosing the recipients of various awards for unusual performance, an attempt has been made to sort out criteria as distinguished from evidence. In the last analysis, criteria and evidence may not always be distinguishable. The aim has been to treat criteria as those principles governing decision-making and evidence as the raw material facts which may demonstrate performance. For example, a requirement of scholarship as a general criterion may embrace the subcriterion of publication. The publications themselves, the standards of the publisher, and the reception of the publication within the discipline may be evidence of the candidates measuring up (or not) with respect to the criterion and subcriterion.

Generally speaking, the majority of award programs are explicit (to the extent that they are adequately described at all) to the criterion level. Most of them do not spell out in any detail the evidence required to support a determination within the criteria listed. Of course, much the same could be said of other key processes of performance evaluation in the system and the academy-at-large.

At any rate, in most programs a great deal is left to the discretion of screening committees as to the kinds of evidence they collect as a basis for the determination and the relative importance they may accord such varied evidence.

It is assumed in several competitions that the fact of a nomination within the general framework of the evaluation process is in itself evidence. The willingness of specified numbers of students, faculty, and/or alumni to initiate nomination procedures is taken as evidence of effectiveness. Some procedures specify that nominations be accompanied by written statements which, as one set of guidelines puts it, "have substantiated explanations which demonstrate the superiority of the candidate in the criteria of good teaching."

Apart from the nomination process, not infrequently letters of support from members and past members of the campus community are sought. In some cases those submitting statements are apprised of the operative criteria in written detail; in others they are left to imagine for themselves "the criteria of good teaching." Procedures tend to assert generalities such as "Considerable weight is given to the student and alumni comments received with the nominations." Some programs have implied more or less complicated "polls" with weighting factors, but the public descriptions of these tend to be imprecise and sketchy.

It would appear that such effective teaching criteria as knowledge of subject matter, selection and organization of material, and fair, consistent, and timely evaluation are considered on the basis of such student, alumni, and colleague testimony as may be available. There is little indication that the systematized local student evaluation of teaching performance available on several campuses is explicitly called for in the published procedures.

Evidence of scholarship tends to consist of lists of publications, research grants received, honors, scholarships, professional appearances, and the like. Occasionally texts of publications, especially articles, are submitted. The relative value of the activity represented by such material appears to be assumed on the basis of editorial judgment, invitations to participate, and selection by peers for positions of responsibility. Favorable reviews of publications and honors accorded them in competitions are sometimes noted and counted.

Similarly, dossier lists of committee assignments, of posts held, of memberships and of special appearances usually constitute the evidence employed to evaluate campus and community service.

"Evidence" in the majority of award decisions appears to be lists of such things as publications, appearances, and appointments complemented by the voluntary written testimony of supportive students, alumni, and colleagues. The volume of these lists and commentaries and their mutual support are generally regarded as a sufficient basis for a screening committee to judge the relative merits of several candidates for an award or set of awards. There is little indication in published procedures for most award competitions of thoroughgoing, methodical gathering and testing of broadly based evidence. This could of course be time- and energy-consuming beyond any reasonable commensuration to the purposes of the evaluative process. And it may be argued that the list-testimony system is adequate to such purposes if pursued with reasonable effort and care. On the other hand, public descriptions of procedures of selection in some award programs do raise questions as to the adequacy of the published criteria and the evidence required to the proposed purposes of the programs.

APPENDIX

CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
LIST OF POLICY BOARD MEMBERS – NOVEMBER 1976

California State College,* **BAKERSFIELD**
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, California 93309
Dr. Thomas M. Watts
School of Behavioral Sciences
(805) 833-2231
ATSS same

California State University, **CHICO**
1st & Normal Streets
Chico, California 95929
Dr. Barbara Johnson
Department of Education
(916) 895-6423 or 6421
ATSS 459-6423 or 6421

California State College, **DOMINGUEZ HILLS**
1000 E. Victoria Street
Dominguez Hills, California 90747
Dr. Lisa Gray-Schellberg
Department of Psychology
(213) 532-4300, ext. 204
ATSS same

California State University, **FRESNO**
Shaw and Cedar Avenues
Fresno, California 93740
Dr. Lyman Heine
Department of Political Science
(209) 487-2055
ATSS same

California State University, **FULLERTON**
Fullerton, California 92634
Dr. James Friel
Department of Mathematics
(714) 870-3288 or 3631
ATSS same

California State University, **HAYWARD**
25800 Hillary Street
Hayward, California 94542
Dr. Carl Eberhard
Department of Music
(415) 881-3135 or 3132
ATSS 533-3135 or 3132

HUMBOLDT State University
Arcata, California 95521
Dr. Robert E. Dickerson
Department of Economics
(707) 826-3224 or 3546
ATSS same

California State University, **LONG BEACH**
1250 Bellflower Boulevard
Long Beach, California 90840
Dr. David Whitcomb
Center for Faculty Development
(213) 498-5287
ATSS same

California State University, **LOS ANGELES**
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, California 90032
Mr. Joseph Schmidt, Library
(213) 224-2268
ATSS 683-2268

California State University, **NORTHRIDGE**
18111 Nordhoff Street
Northridge, California 91330
Dr. Earl Wallis
School of Comm. and Prof. Studies
(213) 885-3001
ATSS 672-3001

California State Polytechnic University, **POMONA**
3801 West Temple Avenue
Pomona, California 91768
Dr. Katherine Seibert
Academic Affairs
(714) 598-4716
ATSS same

California State University, **SACRAMENTO**
6000 J Street
Sacramento, California 95819
Dr. June E. Stuckey
Academic Affairs
(916) 454-2859
ATSS 433-2859

California State College, **SAN BERNARDINO**
5500 State College Parkway
San Bernardino, California 92407
Dr. Robert A. Lee
Academic Affairs
(814) 887-7510
ATSS 669-7510

SAN DIEGO State University*
5300 Campanile Drive
San Diego, California 92182
Dr. Shirley Anne Rush
Academic Affairs
(714) 286-5165
ATSS 636-5165

SAN FRANCISCO State University**
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, California 94132
Dr. Robert Picker
Department of Geography
(415) 469-2281 or 1381
ATSS 554-2281 or 1381

SAN JOSE State University
125 South Seventh Street
San Jose, California 95192
Dr. Barbara Lopossa
Department of Education
(408) 277-2679 or 2681
ATSS 522-2679 or 2681

California Polytechnic State University, **SAN LUIS OBISPO**
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
Dr. Robert Alberti
Counseling and Testing Center
(805) 546-2511
ATSS 628-2511

California State College, **SONOMA**
1801 East Cotati Avenue
Rohnert Park, California 94928
Dr. Yvette Fallandy
Academic Affairs
(707) 664-2107
ATSS same

California State College, **STANISLAUS**
800 Monte Vista Avenue
Turlock, California 95380
Dr. Douglas Taylor
Department of English
(209) 633-2278 or 2361
ATSS 427-2278 or 2361

Office of the Chancellor*
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802
Dr. Dorothy Miller
Faculty and Staff Affairs
(213) 590-5605
ATSS 635-5605

Statewide Academic Senate*
381 Parkfair Drive (home address)
Sacramento, California 95825
Dr. Dorothy Sexter, Dept. of History
(916) 454-6282 or 6206
ATSS 433-6282 or 6206

Student Representative
Mr. Andre Shamberger
c/o Associated Students
CSU Los Angeles
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, California 90032
(213) 224-3595
ATSS 683-3595

Student Representative
Mrs. Patricia Atkins
CSU Northridge
7732 Bakeman Street
Sun Valley, California
(213) 765-2231

Student Representative
Ms. Stacy Haley
c/o Center for Professional Development
CSC Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, California 93309
(805) 833-2359
ATSS same

Office of the Chancellor*
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802
Dr. David H. Provost
New Program Development and Evaluation
(213) 590-5714
ATSS 635-5714

*Member, Steering Committee
**Chairman, Steering Committee and Policy Board

APPENDIX B

THE COURSEWORK FEE WAIVER PROGRAM

For the first time in the academic year 1975-76 faculty (and staff) in the CSUC system were able to take courses on their campuses (and others by arrangement) for a substantially reduced fee. For faculty wishing to take coursework in professionally related areas, this program provided in effect a grant of $50 to $100, depending on the number of units attempted and the fees normally applicable to the participant.

The program proceeds ultimately from Trustee-sponsored AB 3958 Arnett (1974), which upon adoption became Section 23763 of the Education Code. The text of that short section reads as follows:

> 23763. To enhance the opportunities for California State University and Colleges employees to participate in training and career development the trustees may, subject to such rules and regulations as they may establish, waive entirely or reduce any or all fees for such employees who enroll in work-related courses offered by the California State University and Colleges necessary for improving skills for existing jobs or advancement in accordance with a career development plan at the California State University and Colleges.

The legislation is permissive (the Trustees are not required to respond to it) and any program initiated under it is "subject to such rules and regulations as they (the Trustees) may establish." It became effective on January 1, 1975.

On January 25, 1975, the Trustees adopted an amendment to the California Administrative Code, Title 5, which authorizes the fee waiver program and establishes certain basic guidelines for the program.

The Trustee authorization was transmitted to the campuses on April 1, 1975 with a delegation of authority to the presidents and guidelines in the form of Executive Order #218.

A few campuses allowed a few such waivers in spring 1975, but the program on a full and official basis was not possible until academic year 1975-76.

The program allows for the routine waiver or reduction of fees for as many as six (6) semester units per semester. Those fees which will be fully waived are:

1. Application fee
2. Student Services fee (formerly Materials and Services fee)
3. Identification card fee.

Those fees which will be reduced to $1.00 each are:

1. Student Body Association fee
2. Student Center fee
3. Health Facilities fee.

This means that an enrollment in a three-unit course will cost the faculty member $3.00 instead of $62.50. For a first-time enrollment entailing admissions application, the waiver program will save an additional $20.00; a six-unit course load will be $3.00 instead of the usual $80.50.

The six-unit maximum limitation is applied in the regulations to employees working full-time without formal leave or release from specified regular, assigned duties; as described in another section below, the program can cover more than six units in conjunction with approved leaves.

On the basis of recommendation of the faculty member's campus of employment, he/she may qualify for the waiver and reduction for courses taken on another campus in the system.

The fee waivers and reductions in these provisions are not applicable to courses in such self-support programs as extension, summer and special sessions, and external degrees.

In order to qualify for the program, the participant must satisfy the following requirements:

1. Be a full-time permanent or probationary employee. (Under current guidelines part-time employees, full-time temporary employees, graduate assistants, and students assistants are not eligible. Employees who are on approved leaves of absence, full-time or partial, are still classified as full-time employees for purposes of this program.)

2. Be admitted to the University either under regular admissions requirements or under the special admissions program described in the California Administrative Code, Section 41804(e).

3. Receive supervisory approval certifying the appropriateness of the course(s) to the work and career of the employee. (For faculty members, the personal statement on the application form expressed in terms of professional development normally satisfies this requirement.)

The basic waiver and reduction in this program assumes a maximum of six (6) semester units per semester for those on full-time service. Application of the provisions to more than six units per term may be approved within the following schedule of units attempted and authorized leaves:

Percentage of Leave	Maximum Units per Term
One-fourth but less than half	9
One-half but less than three-fourths	12
Three-fourths but less than full	15
Full	No limit

The Executive Order provides for the approved release of time for employees to attend classes during "working hours." Teaching and office hour schedules for faculty are sufficiently flexible to accommodate various coursework arrangements without impinging upon employment responsibilities. Such accommodations would be worked out in advance of the term involved by the faculty member and his/her academic unit.

Some campuses have done little more with this program than to make its availability known. It appears on most campuses to be more actively implemented for staff than for faculty, with the somewhat more structured "career plan" and need for arrangements for the employee to be away from his/her post at class time. Campuses vary greatly in the tone and degree of restriction of local implementing guidelines. However, a few campuses, usually through the Campus Faculty Development Program, have fairly fully developed the potential of the fee waiver arrangement. Nearly 10% of the eligible academic employees on one campus were taking coursework on a fee waiver basis during spring 1976, averaging nearly four semester units per participant. In a typical case, a faculty member is taking a course in a field now demonstrably relevant to his/her own discipline, e.g., computer science, statistics. Some are doing work in enrichment of background

(e.g., the literature teacher taking history) which may have been wished for during graduate school days, but time pressures prohibited such exploration. A few are taking work in preparation for leaves, e.g., Spanish looking toward a sabbatical in South America. A few (especially librarians) are completing degrees. Some graduate schools have agreed to count specified courses for faculty finishing doctorates.

On those campuses taking an interest in facilitating faculty participation in the program, the faculty tend to view the opportunity as a "bonus" encouragement for professional growth.

APPENDIX C

SPECIAL SALARY RANGES: GRANT-RELATED INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

The ultimate failure of the so-called "1970 New Salary Schedule" has been described in another section of this report. That schedule, had it been implemented, would have allowed movement into three merit steps, five, ten, or fifteen percent in salary range beyond the theretofore established top of the scale. In that connection, the report records the eventual abandonment of very similar "super-steps" in the Report of the most recent Ad Hoc Committee for the Procurement and Retention of a Quality Faculty. In both of these plans the extended salary ranges would have been underwritten by *state* funds.

At its November 26, 1974, meeting the Board of Trustees did establish a program of extended salary ranges, but they are tied to the use of private funds.

Such an arrangement had been sought for some time by the Bakersfield campus, which had received a substantial bequest to be used for such a purpose, among other purposes. Other campuses had expressed interest in having the capacity to grant funds for salary augmentation.

The action by the Board was embraced in the following three-part resolution:

> **RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University and Colleges, that the Board approves the establishment of a program for increased salary ranges for faculty selected in accordance with criteria and procedures established at each campus and within funding received by private and foundation grants made available for that purpose, as summarized in Agenda Item No. 4 of the November 25-26, 1974 Agenda of the Committee on Faculty and Staff Affairs of the Board; and be it further
>
> **RESOLVED**, That before implementation of such programs, campus procedures be identified and reported by the Chancellor to the Board of Trustees; and be it further
>
> **RESOLVED** That the Chancellor is authorized to take such actions as he shall consider appropriate to implement program.

As the first resolved clause indicates, the details of implementation were either described in the *Agenda* item #4 or left to the discretion of the Chancellor and the campuses. The *Agenda* item proposed the establishment of new classes for salary purposes entitled "Grant-Related Instructional Faculty." The salary ranges associated with these classes are to be funded by individual gifts and bequests and by foundation allocations. Designed for both academic year and twelve-month appointments, they allow a salary augmentation of from five to twenty-five percent of the salary base of the rank and step at which the recipient was appointed (if newly recruited) or at which he would normally have been located (if continuing). In the typical case, the grant does not fund the total salary of a faculty member involved, but pays only the difference between the increased range and the regular range, as well as the employer's PERS contribution related to such difference.

The dual purposes of the extended ranges as stated in the proposal are (1) "to retain faculty of regional or national stature and (2) to make it possible for the campuses to attract eminent faculty." Perhaps because such application has clearly been more acceptable among faculty in the system, discussion and arguments in favor of the program emphasized the *recruitment* rather than the *retention* aspect, but both were clearly provided for in the proposal.

Appointment of a faculty member to one of the new classes is made by the President of the campus upon faculty consultation and recommendation procedures similar to those utilized by the campuses in other faculty personnel actions. Any additional, related stipulations applied to the selection of recipients must be arrived at by normal policy-making processes on the campuses.

Each appointment is limited to a period up to one academic year or twelve-month period, but appointments may be repeated pursuant to the operation of established personnel processes and recommendations and within the limitations of grant support. No tenure accrual or salary rights attach to such a position separate from the tenure rights and salary normally accruing from the basic regular full-time faculty appointment. An appointment to the class does not constitute a promotion and termination or non-renewal of an appointment does not constitute a demotion.

The Board adopted the proposal in face of opposition from the systemwide Academic Senate and other faculty groups. Such organizations have within recent years fairly consistently opposed the offical establishment of additional salary classes and salary ranges. They have supported enriched term appointments for distinguished *visiting* professors and grants, leaves, and endowed chairs for regular faculty. In part, the arguments in opposition to special salary ranges for regular faculty, whether supported by state or provide funds, stress the impact on morale of recognizing "stellar" professors and paying them more for normal functions, the possible depressing effect on efforts to achieve general salary increases, and the possibility in use of private funds of political and biased ideological intrusions on the academy.

The Board added what became the second resolved clause to the two originally recommended by the Chancellor's staff. Ostensibly in reaction to faculty concerns about controls, the resolution requires that "before implementation of such programs, campus procedures be identified and reported by the Chancellor to the Board of Trustees."

At the next regular meeting of the Board (January 29, 1975), in response to this requirement, the Bakersfield campus submitted changes in its *Faculty Handbook* related to appointments to the new classes entitled Grant-Related Instructional Faculty. There were two significant changes in local procedures occasioned by the new program. All positions involved in the augmentation were to be distinguished by their official description. Moreover, recommendations with respect to appointments to positions for which an increased salary range is provided are to be made by the regular College Review Committee extraordinarily augmented by the RPT committee of the school in which the position is proposed. These revised procedures were presented for the information of the Board and did not therefore require action. No objections were raised.

To date, only the Bakersfield campus has had such a plan approved and established a program under the Grant-Related Instructional Faculty arrangement.

In the 1975-76 academic year one academic year appointee from the Bakersfield faculty was paid augmented salary utilizing funds from the E.C. (Gene) Reid Memorial Fund for California State College, Bakersfield. The campus has established two such positions; one will probably continue to be given to a current faculty member; the second is likely to be used next year for recruiting an outstanding professor from off-campus.

This survey discovered active interest in this salary augmentation program on only one other campus. Long Beach has submitted proposed guidelines to the Chancellor's Office for eventual Board perusal, but they have not as yet been agendized. There appears to be some question as to whether the proposal has "faculty" support on campus and at present no funds are available at Long Beach for implementation of the proposed program.